DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 340 PS 019 826

AUTHOR Cosden, Merith; Zimmer, Jules
TITLE Age of Entry, Holding Out and Kindergarten Retention: Differences as a Function of Gender and Ethnicity.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ethnicity; *Grade Repetition; High Risk Students; *Hispanic Americans; *Kindergarten; *Kindergarten Children; Primary Education; *School Entrance Age; School Readiness; *Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS California (South)

ABSTRACT

This study tested hypotheses regarding the relation of differences in kindergarten entry and rentention that relate to gender and ethnicity. Hypotheses were: (1) the age at which children enter kindergarten would vary as a function of their gender and ethnicity; (2) children who were held out of kindergarten would be in the younger part of their cohort, and Anglo boys would be held out more frequently than females or Latinos; (3) kindergarten retention would be affected by age, gender, and ethnicity. Data on kindergarten students in three southern California school districts were collected between 1989 and 1991. School records were used to obtain data on students' birthdates, gender, and ethnicity. Teachers indicated which students were retained or would be retained the following year. Information on students who had been held out of kindergarten was obtained. Results showed that in the school district with the lowest Latino population, the child's age of entry varied as a function of gender and ethnicity; the predicted holding out pattern for boys and Anglos was evident; and retention decisions were also affected by age, gender, and ethnicity. These results were not duplicated in the other two districts, which had larger Latino populations. A list of 30 references is included. (BC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Age of Entry, Holding Out and Kindergarten Retention: Differences as a Function of Gender and Ethnicity

Merith Cosden & Jules Zimmer
Department of Education
University of California, Santa Barbara

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Merith Cosden
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

American Educational Research Association
Chicago, Illinois
April, 1991

ED338340

The importance of high quality early education for children at risk for school failure is well documented (e.g. Casto & Mastropieri, 1986; Schweinhart & Weikart, 1985). In addition to providing students with the requisite academic and social 'readiness' skills, early formal schooling experiences set the stage for parent and child expectations regarding future success in the educational system.

Several major trends, including an increase in the academic demands of kindergartens and the tendency for some parents to hold their children out of kindergarten until they are older, are having a significant impact on the nature of kindergarten programs (e.g. Freeman & Hatch, 1989; National Association of the Education of Young Children, 1988; Shepard & Smith, 1988). The impact of these trends on children from ethnic minority groups has yet to be explored. In particular, the impact of the escalation of the kindergarten curriculum on minority children needs to be addressed, as many minority children do not have access to educational alternatives to kindergarten and enter kindergarten based on their chronological age rather than on their readiness skills.

PS 019826

Changes in kindergarten programs

This change has been described as a reconceptualization of the primary purpose of the kindergarten environment from 'ministering to the nature and needs of young children' (Hill, 1987) to preparing students for the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

academic requirements of first grade. This movement is typified by an 'escalation' of the academic content in the kindergarten curriculum as well as a general 'aging' of students enrolled in kindergarten programs. For example, children are expected to show competence in a number of academic areas in order to be promoted to first grade (Jackson, 1975), while school principals report a relatively high priority given to academic achievement in their kindergarten programs (Educational Research Service, 1986). In tandem with these curricular changes, many parents are electing to keep children who would be among the youngest in their cohort out of school an additional year to better prepare them to be 'successful' in their kindergarten program (Shepard & Smith, 1988; Mergendoller, Bellisimo & Horan, 1990).

A number of factors appear to drive these trends. As more children are attending preschool programs and watching educational television shows such as Sesame Street, more are also coming to kindergarten with skills in reading, writing and mathematics. Teachers report that parents are pressuring them to increase the academic content of early education programs, judging their effectiveness as teachers through the academic accomplishments of the kindergarten students (Shepard & Smith, 1988). Further, while holding children out of school until they are older is often described as a response to changes in kindergarten programs, this action in itself may contribute to the acceleration of academic demands (Shepard & Smith, 1988).

These trends raise several concerns. First, there is a general concern for the quality and appropriateness of the education provided to young children. According to the National Association for the Education of Young Children (1988) the trend towards early academics is 'antithetical' to developmentally appropriate programming for young children. In addition

to the rigidity often inherent in programs designed to prepare students for the next year's curriculum, expectations have become so high that many students experience failure (Charlesworth, 1989; Shepard & Smith, 1987).

Potential impact of kindergarten changes on Minority children

Sue & Padilla (1986) hypothesize that parents of minority students want their children to succeed in school, but don't have enough information about the school culture to make decisions which will help their success. Other studies (e.g. Lynch & Stein, 1987) indicate that Hispanic families in particular are less knowledgeable and less involved in the schools than are parents of Black or Anglo children. A parental decision to hold a child out of kindergarten until the child is 'ready' is based on that parent's awareness of the kindergarten curriculum as well as the potential impact of the child not being ready to meet school demands (i.e. grade retention). To the extent that some parents from minority groups do not have access to this information, they would not be expected to consider or even conceptualize school readiness issues as would families with greater access to the school system.

Fiscal issues also impact the decision of when a child enters kindergarten. Middle class parents have more options available to them than do families from lower socioeconomic brackets. An informal survey of all local subsidized daycare and preschool programs, including Head Start programs, found that all shared a common 'rule;' if a child turned five within the legally mandated period to enter kindergarten that year, the child was required to leave the program and enter kindergarten regardless of school readiness skills. Non-subsidized daycare and preschool programs do not require children who are five to leave a program, however, and commonly advocate that parents of younger children, particularly younger

boys, hold their children out of kindergarten an additional year to make them more ready for formal schooling.

To the extent that select children are held out of school an extra year, while other children do not have that option, two strata of kindergarten students may be formed: 1) a cohort of older, more academically 'ready' students, from the middle class and dominant culture, and 2) a younger cohort of students from lower socioeconomic and ethnic minority backgrounds. The impact of this stratification on the early schooling experiences of different children remains to be explored.

Kindergarten retention and Minority students

In tandem with the escalation of the kindergarten curriculum and the increased presence of older children in kindergarten classes there has been as increase in the use of kindergarten retention. To the extent that the kindergarten curriculum is focussed on the needs of the older children, younger, less academically 'ready' students, many from ethnic-minority groups, may not have their needs adequately met, or may not appear as 'ready' as their older peers for first grade work.

Kindergarten retention rates have risen across the country over the past 10 years. In Florida, for example, retention rates for kindergarten children tripled between the 1977-78 and 1985-86 school years (Soto, 1988). Retention rates appear to be effected by a number of factors, including the kindergarten curriculum and the child's ability to perform well within that curriculum (Byrnes & Yamamoto, 1986; Cross, 1984), the teacher's ability to work with students who have diverse skills (Byrnes & Yamamoto, 1986; Faerber & Van Dusseldorp, 1984; Smith and Shepard,1988), and school policies (Smith & Shepard, 1988). Many teachers feel that by giving a child the "gift" of an extra year, he will return to school a more self-assured, competent kindergartner (Smith & Shepard, 1988). Byrnes and

Yamamoto (1986) found that a large percentage of teachers and principals surveyed supported retention based on "emotional immaturity, academic failure for reasons other than lack of basic skills, and excessive absences" and that children were retained not only because they needed to gain skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic but also on the basis of attitude, work habits, attendance, conduct, and maturity. School policies on the use of retention vary both within and across districts. Concerns are raised both by the nature of some of these policies as well as by the absence of formal policies and the potential for abuse of grade retention under these conditions (Walker, 1984).

Despite arguments that school retention is a viable solution for the remediation of academic deficits (i.e. that it allows children with fewer school readiness skills an opportunity to "catch up" to their peers), the research suggests that retention may not have positive effects, and could potentially have negative effects. Holmes and Matthews (1984) conducted a meta-analysis of current studies on retention across all grades. They found that retained students scored approximately .37 standard deviation units below their non retained peers in academic achievement, personal adjustment, self-concept, attitude toward school, and attendance, suggesting that retention did not enable these students to fully catch up with their peers. Further, studies indicate that retention, at least at upper grade levels, is correlated with subsequent school failure as measured by the likelihood of dropping out of school (Bachman, Green, & Wirtanen, 1971; Borus & Carpenter, 1984).

While the relationship of later school failure and kindergarten retention has not been systematically explored, the relationship between retention at upper grades and school failure suggests that the impact of this intervention at the kindergarten level needs to be assessed. Finally,

several studies indicate that grade retention, including kindergarten retention, is often perceived as a failure by the child and can result in low self-esteem and social maladjustment (Holmes & Matthews, 1984; Godfrey, 1972; Niklason, 1987; Smith & Shepard, 1988; Yamamoto, 1980). This suggests that the impact of kindergarten retention on school expectations, by parents, teachers and the students themselves, also needs to be further addressed.

In spite of these research outcomes, retention is still viewed by school personnel as a viable means of remediating academic deficits and social immaturity (Shepard and Smith, 1986). In fact, even teachers who do not make frequent use of retention view it as a positive step for children who are experiencing difficulty in school (Shepard and Smith, 1988). Thus, the use of kindergarten retention remains an issue.

If the child is unable to succeed in kindergarten, both implicit and explicit messages may be sent to the child and their family regarding the likelihood for the child's future success in the educational system. As a consequence of having limited access to pre-school classes children from linguistic minority groups may enter kindergarten with fewer readiness skills, making them more vulnerable to early school failure. These sociocultural variables, such as limited access to opportunities and the development of a poor student self concept, have been viewed by others as having a significant impact on the school success or failure of minority students (Ogbu & Matute-Bianchi, 1986).

While there is a larger body of research focussed on later school problems (e.g. dropping out) for children from some linguistic minority groups, there is surprisingly little attention in the literature on the impact of early educational experiences on students and their families with regard to academic preparation for later schooling, or the development of social

expectations for educational success. *Early experiences may have a significant impact on the manner in which students experience the educational system in years to come, and that these experiences warrant further attention.*

Purpose

This study was designed to test hypotheses regarding systematic differences in the age at which children enter kindergarten as related to that child's gender and ethnicity. The impact of age of entry, gender and ethnicity to holding out and retention decisions was also assessed.

It was hypothesized that:

1). The age at which children enter kindergarten would vary, in part, as a function of their gender and ethnicity. Boys were expected to be generally older than girls. Latino children were expected to be overrepresented at the younger end of the continuum.

2). Some children are being been 'held out' of school by their parents a year past the age at which they can legally enter kindergarten. Those children who were held out would have been in the youngest part of their cohort had they entered when legally able to do so. Boys from the Anglo culture were expected to be held out more than females or Latinos.

3). Kindergarten retention decisions would be effected by the child's age, gender and ethnicity. Age, gender and ethnicity were expected to play a role in retention decisions. These effects were expected to be cumulative, with younger Latino boys particularly vulnerable for retention.

Methods

Subjects

Data were collected on all 1989-1990 kindergarten students in two school districts in Southern California, and on all 1990-1991 kindergarten students in a third district. District A has 8 elementary schools and 21

kindergarten programs with approximately 586 kindergarten students. Latino students comprise 24.94% of all students in that district. District B has 11 elementary schools and 40 kindergarten programs. Of the 987 kindergarten students enrolled, approximately 68% of students are Latino, 26% Anglo, and 6% from other ethnic minority groups (e.g. Black, Asian, Filipino, Pacific Islander). District C, from which 1990-1991 school data were collected all kindergarten students are enrolled in an Early Childhood Learning Center located on one school site. There are nine kindergarten classes with an Average Daily Attendance across classes of 257. Student enrollment is approximately 50% Latino, 47% Anglo, and 3% other (Black, Asian, Filipino).

Procedures

School records were used to obtain data on birthdates, gender and ethnicity. Teachers were asked to indicate those students in their classes who 1) had already been retained in kindergarten, or 2) were being recommended for kindergarten retention the following year. Students who had not been retained but whose birthdate fell outside the normal deadlines for that cohort were labelled 'held out', indicating that their parents had not enrolled them in kindergarten the first year in which they legally qualified for school. This action was verified through teacher reports on many of the students in this group who had spoken with the parents of these children the year prior to the study and had helped them to reach a decision not to enroll the child in school until they were older.

Results

Analyses focussed on patterns of kindergarten entry in relation to child age, gender and ethnicity, as well as school responses to children, in terms of class placements and retention decisions. Data from each district were

analyzed separately to allow the examiners to consider differences as well as generalizations across school systems.

Age of entry: gender and ethnicity

All Anglo and Latino children were included in this analysis with the exception of those who had been retained; thus, the analysis reflects differences in age of entry for children first entering the school system.

Table 1 shows gender differences in age of entry across districts. In District A, which had the lowest Latino population (25%) gender was significantly related to age of entry, $F(1,487)= 5.56$, $p<.05$, with the mean age for boys entering school older than the mean age for girls. Significant gender differences were not found in Districts B (68% Latino) or C (50% Latino).

Differences in age of entry also varied as a function of ethnicity in both District A, $F(1,487)= 7.67$, $p<.01$, and District C, $F(1, 247)= 11.04$, $p<.01$, (see Table 2). In all three Districts, Latino children were younger as a group than were Anglo students.

Holding out: gender and ethnicity

The number of children held out of school past the age at which they could legally enter was assessed as a function of gender and ethnicity (see Tables 3 and 4). In District A, 54 students (9.76% of the cohort) were held out by their parents. Boys were more likely to be held out than girls, x^2 $(1, N=586) = 22.06$, $p<.001$, while Anglo students were more likely than Latino students to be held out, x^2 $(1, N=522) = 27.40$, $p<.001$. In District B, 100 students (10.73% of incoming students) had been held out by their parents, but significant differences were not obtained as a function of ethnicity or gender. In District C, 26 students (10.97% of the incoming cohort) had been held out. Statistically significant differences across groups were not noted.

Retention: gender and ethnicity

Tables 5 and 6 present data on prior retention patterns as a function of gender and ethnicity. In District A, 33 kindergarten students had been retained and were repeating kindergarten. More boys than girls had been retained, $x^2(1, N=586) = 47.62$, $p<.05$, and more Latino than Anglo students, $x^2 (1, N=522) = 14.06$, $p<.001$. Tables 7 and 8 reflect children were were recommended for retention the following year. In District A, 44 students (7.5% of all students) were recommended for retention. More of these students were boys, $x^2(1, N=586) = 50.05$, $p<.001$, or Latino, $x^2 (1, N=522) = 35.47$, $p<.001$.

In District B, 55 students had been retained (see Tables 5 & 6). Statistically significant differences in retention as a function of gender or ethnicity were not obtained. In addition, 42 students (4% of all students) were recommended for retention. No differences were noted as a function of gender or ethnicity in that district (see Tables 7 & 8). However, a larger group of students ($N=137$, 12.76% of the incoming class) were 'advanced' to first grade despite concerns regarding their readiness for first grade work (see Table 9). Students in this category were advanced because of parent and/or teacher perceptions that retention was not a good idea; this decision could have been based on a child's age, size, performance or prior retention. Significant differences were obtained on this variable, both for gender, $x^2 (1, N=987) = 4.27$, $p<.05$, and for ethnicity, $x^2 (1, N=921) = 4.26$, $p<.05$. That is, a greater proportion of boys than girls, and a greater proportion of Latino than Anglo students were promoted despite concerns regarding their readiness.

In District C, data were collected at the beginning of a school year, thus only data on students already retained were available. In this district, 20 students (7.78% of the cohort) had been retained. While the majority of

these students were Latino boys, chi squares analyses across groups were not significant.

Age, holding out and retention patterns

The relationship between age and retention and holding out patterns was also explored. To do this, the birth months of students who were held out, retained, 'advanced', or recommended for retention were examined. Birthmonths indicate where children would fall by age in their cohorts if they entered when legally able to do so. Children born between September and November would be the youngest in their school cohort in California, given the Dec. 1 deadline for kindergarten entry. Each subsequent quartile (June-August, March-May, December-February) represents children who would be sequentially older in relation to their cohort if they entered school when legally able to do so.

Table 10 indicates the birthmonths for children held out by their parents. As hypothesized, most of the children held were in the youngest quartile, with the rest primarily in the youngest half of their cohort. Children who were held out would have been in the youngest part of their cohort had they entered school when legally able to do so.

Age effects for retained students are similar (see Table 11). That is, students who had been retained were in the younger part of their cohort, with most of them in the youngest quartile.

In District B, an additional group of students were identified, those 'advanced' despite reservations in their academic performance. As indicated in Table 12, these children were distributed more evenly across the age spectrum.

In Districts A and B data on children recommended for retention the following year were also available. As seen in Table 13, a pattern similar

to previously retained children emerged. That is, most of the children recommended for retention were young relative to their classroom peers.

Differences in student distributions across classes

In two of the Districts (District B and C) data were available on a class by class basis. During the course of data collection, it became apparent that both the ethnicity and age of students had an impact on class placements. Tables 14 and 15 present differences in classroom composition and retention and holding out patterns. In District B, the ethnicity of classes ranged from 61 to 93% Latino in school 1, 61 to 80% in school 2, 22 to 79% in school 3, and 30 to 96% in school 4. Variations in the mean age of students within classes, and differences in the number of held out and retained children across classes were also apparent. For District C, all Kindergarten classes were housed within one school. Visual inspection of the data suggest differences in both the age and ethnic composition of classes, despite written policies which supported random assignment of students to all classes except the monolingual Spanish speaking classes. The ethnicity of classes within that school for the non-monolingual classes varied from 39% to 19% Latino, with mean age of classes ranging from 63 to 66 months old.

In order to look at the impact of class placement on holding out and retention patterns, correlations were conducted between measures of classroom tendencies, including the mean age of students, the proportion of students who were Latino and Anglo, and the number of children held out, retained or recommended for retention within each class.

For District B, significant correlations were obtained between the mean age of the class and the number of children in the class who had been held out ($r = .35$, $p < .05$) or retained ($r = .26$, $p = .05$). Classes with a greater number of students recommended for retention also tended to have more

boys (r=.42, p<.01), Latinos (r=.37, p<.05) and Anglo boys (r=.51, p<.01). Other relationships were not significant.

In District C, the mean age of the class was significantly related to classroom composition with regard to ethnicity. Younger classes tended to have more Latino students (r=.71, p<.05) and fewer Anglo students (r=.67, p<.05). Relationships between age, retention and holding out patterns were not significant, perhaps given the small number of subjects in the analysis (N=9 classes).

Differences in school policies for retention

Finally, differences in parent holding out and school retention policies were explored across schools. As indicated in Table 16, significant variations across schools were found, with one school holding to a no retention policy for kindergarten students. Further inquiry found, however, that in some instances schools utilize 1st grade retention in lieu of having children repeat kindergarten. The relationship between holding out and retention patterns and the ethnicity and socioeconomic status of children in a school will be explored in subsequent analyses, using data recently obtained from the State Department of Education.

Discussion

This study found different patterns for school entry across school districts, as summarized in Table 17. District A, which had the lowest Latino population (25%) had patterns which were predicted by the initial hypotheses. That is, children's age of entry varied as a function of gender and ethnicity, holding out patterns for boys and Anglos were evident, and retention decisions were effected by age, gender and ethnicity. This district replicates Shepard's (1986) findings on holding out and retention practices as a function of gender and age, and extends these findings to demonstrate differences in holding out and retention patterns as a function

of ethnicity as well. That is, there was a tendency for Latino children to enter school younger than their peers, and this was associated with increased vulnerability for retention.

Districts B and C had larger Latino populations and did not substantiate the preliminary hypotheses. District B which had the largest (68%) Latino population, did not evidence the predicted age of entry, holding out or retention patterns. However, larger groups of Latino than Anglo students were 'Advanced" despite reservations by the teachers. In District C (50% Latino) Anglo students were somewhat older than Latinos, but significant holding out or retention differences were not obtained.

There are several possible explanations for these different outcomes, particularly in relation to the analysis of ethnicity effects. The major problem is that ethnicity itself is too broad a marker variable to predict individual student effects, and is confounded both by socioeconomic differences within ethnic groups as well as by the students' level of acculturation. For example, in the two districts with larger Latino populations there were also a greater proportion of middle class Latino students for whom the predicted ethnicity effects would not apply.

There are several ways to address the problem of using ethnicity as a marker variable. First, socioeconomic differences across schools can be assessed by utilizing data available from the California State Department of Education. These data, which are currently being analyzed, will provide greater clarity with regard to holding out and retention effects for schools which vary along the socioeconomic dimension.

However, school SES still does not provide individual student information. Further, in the case of District C, children from areas throughout the district attend the same early childhood center. To obtain more specific information about students, acculturation scales may be

useful. A number of acculturation scales are currently available for Latin populations; with regard to determining a child's level of acculturation, some scales rely on parent perceptions while others utilize the child's report. Cloud (1990) reviewed five common acculturation scales and reported that the most widely used scale to date is the ARSMA (Cuellar, Harris & Jasso, 1980). The ARSMA contains 20 questions which have been identified, through factor analysis, as addressing four general areas: language preference, ethnic identification and generation removed from Mexico, ethnicity of friends and associates, and extent of direct contact with Mexico and with ability to read and write in Spanish (Montgomery & Orozco, 1984). Items are presented in both Spanish and English and scored by a five point Likert scale. Validity studies of the scale found it to differentiate individuals with Anglo vs Mexican surnames, and a relationship between generational status and acculturation score has also been obtained (Montgomery & Orozco, 1984). This scale will be used in future studies to consider the impact of acculturation and cultural boundaries on early schooling experiences.

Other findings, such as the relationship between age and holding out and retention patterns, were evidenced across districts. The impact of curricular expectations on these patterns also needs to be explored.

In addition to differences in enrollment and retention patterns across districts, differences in student composition and retention and holding out patterns were evidenced across schools within each district. For example both school districts A and B had one school with no children retained or identified for retention. Similarly, both school districts had schools with relatively high levels of retention; school district A had a school with 9% retained and 16% selected to be retained while school district B had a school with 11% retained and 11% selected to be retained.

Another pattern apparent across two of the districts in which data were available was the non-random placement of children within schools. Reasons for this vary. Informally, some schools report placing children in classes on the basis of age in order to reduce the range of needs within any class. In other schools, however, school policies suggest random assignment of students to classes, but the demographic characteristics of the classes suggest that other factors may be operating. One factor that needs to be further assessed is the impact of parent requests on classroom assignments. In any event, the data suggest the need to consider differences in the instructional opportunities available to students across classes, and to further explore the impact of policies which result in class assignments on the basis of a child's age or ethnicity.

The findings of this study only partially support the trends described by Shepard and her colleagues. Only one of the three districts replicated their findings with regard to differences in age of entry, holding out and retention patterns for boys and girls. This is the district which also demonstrated the predicted effects of ethnicity, with more Latino students entering school at younger ages and more asked to repeat kindergarten . This district is distinguished from the other two districts in that it has a lower proportion of minority students; this was the only district in our study in which the minority students were actually in the minority in their schools.

Different patterns emerged in the relationships between age, gender, ethnicity, school entry and retention decisions in district's in which the Latino enrollments were higher. In District B which had 68% Latino enrollments, differences in age of entry, holding out, and retention patterns were not noted as a function of gender or ethnicity. However, significant gender and ethnicity differences were found for those students

'Advanced' but with concerns regarding their ability to succeed in the next grade. The impact of this action on subsequent school performance and retention decisions remains to be clarified.

Differences in classroom policies within districts and even within schools also have a significant impact on early schooling experiences. Some teachers, for example, do not retain children, while others have high levels of children retained each year. It is clear that the ethnic composition of a school as well as specific district and school policies and classroom teacher decisions all contribute to the retention patterns observed in this study.

Conclusions

A child's first experiences in the public school system are significant. The child's behavior in school, and the responses the child receives from peers, teachers, and administrators, will shape the child's future expectations of the school as well as the school's future expectations of the child.

There is a need to examine the nature of kindergarten experiences for different groups of children. That is, given that children enter school at different ages and with different readiness skills, what impact does this have on their daily experiences, both socially and academically?. Retention decisions impact relatively few students. Many other students may also have needs which are not well met, as suggested by the large number of students in District B who were advanced despite concerns regarding their readiness for 1st grade.

In addition, it is clear that the families' accessibility to the culture of the school will have a significant impact on their child's class placement and classroom experiences as well as the family's response to school recommendations (e.g. for retention). Thus, understanding parent

conceptualizations of 'school readiness', their access to instructional resources, and the relationship of families with the school system is seen as a necessary next step.

References

Bachman, J., Green, S. & Wirtanen, I. (1971). Dropping out: Problem or symptom? Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Borus, M. & Carpenter, S. (1984). Choices in education. In M.E. Borus (Ed.), Youth and the labor market. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Byrnes, D. & Yamamoto, K. (1986). Views on grade retention. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 20, 14-20.

Casto, G. & Mastropieri, M (1986). The efficacy of early intervention programs: a meta-analysis. Exceptional Children, 52, 417-424.

Charlesworth, R. (1989, March). Behind before they start? Deciding how to deal with the risk of kindergarten failure. Young Children, 5-13.

Cloud, N. (1990). Measuring level of acculturation in bilingual, bicultural children. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA

Cross, R. (1984). Teacher decision-making in student retention. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Division H, New Orleans, LA.

Cuellar, I., Harris, L. & Jasso, R. (1980). An acculturation scale for Mexican American normal and clinical populations. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 2, 199-217.

Educational Research Service (1986, May). A kindergarten survey. Principal, 22-23.

Faerber, K. & Van Dusseldorp, R. (1984). Attitudes toward elementary school student retention. Anchorage, AK.: The University of Alaska. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 109)

Freeman, E. & Hatch, J. (1989). What schools expect young children to know and do: an analysis of kindergarten report cards. The Elementary School Journal, 89, 595-605.

Godfrey, E. (1972).The tragedy of failure: Results of a North Carolina survey. Educational Digest, 37, 34-35.

Hill, P. (1987, July). The function of kindergarten. Young Children, 12-19.

Holmes, C. T. & Matthews, K. M. (1984). The effects of nonpromotion on elementary and junior high school pupils: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 54 (2), 225-236.

Jackson, G. B. (1975). The research evidence on the effects of grade retention. Review of Educational Research, 45 (4), 613-635.

Lynch, Eleanor W. & Stein, Robert C. (1987). Parent participation by ethnicity: a comparison of Hispanic, Black, and Anglo families. In Exceptional Children, 105-111.

Mergendoller, J., Bellisimo, Y. & Horan, C. (1990). Kindergarten holding out: the role of school characteristics, family background, and parental perceptions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Montgomery, G. & Orozco, S. (1984). Validation of a measure of acculturation for Mexican Americans. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 6, 53-63.

National Association for the Education of Young Children (1988). NAEYC position statement on standardized testing of young children 3 through 8 years of age. Young Children, 43, 42-47.

Niklason, L. B. (1987). Do certain groups of children profit from a grade retention? Psychology in the Schools, 24, 339-345.

Ogbu, J. & Matute-Bianchi, M. (1986). Understanding sociocultural factors: knowledge, identity, and school adjustment. In Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Children. Bilingual Education Office, California State Department of Education: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Schweinhart, L. & Weikart, D. (1985). Evidence that good early childhood programs work. Phi Delta Kappan, 545-553.

Shepard, L. & Smith, M. (1986). School readiness and kindergarten retention: a policy analysis. Educational Leadership, 44, 78-86.

Shepard, L. & Smith, M. (1987). Effects of kindergarten retention at the end of first grade. Psychology in the Schools, 24, 346-357.

Shepard, L. & Smith, M. (1988). Escalating academic demand in kindergarten: counterproductive policies. The Elementary School Journal, 89, 135-145.

Smith, M. & Shepard, L. (1988). Kindergarten readiness and retention: a qualitative study of teachers' beliefs and practices. American Educational Research Journal.

Soto, L. D (1988). Parental perceptions and practices regarding kindergarten retention. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 294 686).

Sue, S. & Padilla, A. (1986). Ethnic minority issues in the United States: challenges for the educational system. In Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Children. Bilingual Education Office, California State Department of Education: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Walker, N. W. (1984). Elementary grade retention: avoiding abuses through systematic decision-making. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18, 1-6.

Yamamoto, K. (1980, September). Children under stress: The causes and cures. In Family Weekly, Ogden Standard Examiner, 6-8.

Table 1

Age of school entry as a function of gender

	Girls		Boys		
District	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	F
A	63.42	4.16	64.62	4.29	5.56*
B	64.18	5.20	64.73	5.24	2.70
C	64.23	3.82	64.39	4.42	0.08

* $p < .05$

Table 2

Age of school entry as a function of ethnicity

	Latino		Anglo		
District	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	F
A	63.17	4.10	64.40	4.28	7.67**
B	64.52	5.43	64.50	4.88	0.00
C	63.56	4.18	65.25	3.95	11.04**

** $p < .01$

Table 3

Distribution of children held out prior to kindergarten as a function of gender

---

District A

	No. Held Out	No. Entering in Birth Cohort
Girls	16	253
Boys	38	279

χ^2 (1,N=586) = 22.06, p< .001

District B

	No. Held Out	No. Entering in Birth Cohort
Girls	43	410
Boys	57	422

χ^2 (1,N=932) = 1.41 p=.24

District C

	No. Held Out	No. Entering in Birth Cohort
Girls	8	94
Boys	18	117

χ^2 (1,N=237) = 1.79, p=.18

Table 4

Distribution of children held out prior to kindergarten as a function of ethnicity

District A

	No. Held Out	No. Entering in Birth Cohort
Anglo	43	323
Latino	8	148

χ^2 (1,N=522)=27.40, p< .001

District B

	No. Held Out	No. Entering in Birth Cohort
Anglo	29	206
Latino	68	565

χ^2 (1,N=868) = 0.44, p=.51

District C

	No. Held Out	No. Entering in Birth Cohort
Anglo	15	96
Latino	10	109

χ^2 (1,N=230) = 1.55, p=.21

Table 5

Distribution of children repeating kindergarten as a function of gender

District A

	No. Repeating	No. Not Repeating
Girls	9	260
Boys	24	293

χ^2 (1,N=586) = 47.62, p<.05

District B

	No. Repeating	No. Not Repeating
Girls	22	453
Boys	33	479

χ^2 (1,N=987) = 1.54, p=.21

District C

	No. Repeating	No. Not Repeating
Girls	6	102
Boys	14	135

χ^2 (1,N=257) = 1.29, p=.26

Table 6

Distribution of children repeating kindergarten as a function of ethnicity

District A

	No. Repeating	No. Not Repeating
Anglo	18	96
Latino	13	143

χ^2 (1,N=522) = 14.06, p< .001

District B

	No. Repeating	No. Not Repeating
Anglo	10	235
Latino	43	633

χ^2 (1,N=921) = 1.72, p=.19

District C

	No. Repeating	No. Not Repeating
Anglo	7	111
Latino	12	119

χ^2 (1,N=249) = .92, p=.33

Table 7

Distribution of children recommended for retention as a function of gender

District A

	No. Recommended	No. Not Recommended
Girls	12	257
Boys	32	285

χ^2 (1,N=586) = 50.05, p<.001

District B

	No. Recommended	No. Not Recommended
Girls	17	458
Boys	25	487

χ^2 (1,N=987) = 1.03, p=.31

Table 8

Distribution of children recommended for retention as a function of ethnicity

District A

	No. Recommended	No. Not Recommended
Anglo	20	346
Latino	20	136

χ^2 (1,N=522) = 35.47, p< .001

District B

	No. Recommended	No. Not Recommended
Anglo	9	236
Latino	31	645

χ^2 (1,N=921) = 0.36, p= .55

Table 9

Distribution of children advanced in district B as a function of gender and ethnicity

Gender

	No. Advanced	No. Not Advanced
Girl	52	423
Boy	85	427

χ^2 (1,N=987) = 4.27, p< .05

Ethnicity

	No. Advanced	No. Not Advanced
Anglo	24	221
Latino	102	574

χ^2 (1,N=921) = 4.26 p< .05

Table 10

Birthmonths for children held out by parents

District	N	N_{ho}	Birthdate			
			(Sep-Nov)	(Jun-Aug)	(Mar-May)	(Dec-Feb)
A	586	54[a]	70.37%[b]	27.78	0	1.85
B	987	100[c]	44.00	32.00	13.00	11.00
C	257	26[d]	57.69	38.46	3.85	0

a = Number of children held out from entering Kindergarten for a year in district A (9.21% of all children)

b = Percent of all children in district A who had been held out born within Sep-Nov range).

c = Number of children held out from entering Kindergarten for a year in district B (10.13% of all children)

d = Number of children held out from entering Kindergarten for a year in district C (10.12% of all children)

Table 11

Birthmonths for children repeating kindergarten

District	N	N_{ret}	Birthdate			
			(Sep-Nov)	(Jun-Aug)	(Mar-May)	(Dec-Feb)
A	586	33[a]	39.39%[b]	33.33	27.27	0
B	987	55[c]	40.00	32.73	18.18	9.09
C	257	20[d]	70.00	15.00	15.00	0

a = Number of children repeating Kindergarten for a year in district A (5.63% of all children)

b = Percent of all children in district A who had been retained born within Sep-Nov range).

c = Number of children repeating Kindergarten for a year in district B (5.57% of all children)

d = Number of children repeating Kindergarten for a year in district C (7.78% of all children)

Table 12

Kindergarten entry age for children 'advanced' despite poor readiness

District	N	N_a	Age in Months at Kindergarten Entry				
			57-59	60-62	63-65	66-68	69+
B	987	137[a]	29.2%[b]	23.4	13.1	16.8	17.5

a = Number of children in district B advanced despite poor readiness (13.9% of all students

b = Percent of advanced children born in that age group

Table 13

Kindergarten entry age for children to be retained

District	N	N_{tbr}	Age in Months at Kindergarten Entry				
			57-59	60-62	63-65	66-68	69+
A	522	40[a]	60.0[b]	25.0	5.0	7.5	2.5
B	987	42[c]	42.9	23.8	26.2	4.8	2.4

a = Number of children in district A to be retained (7.7% of all students)

b = Percent of to be retained children born in that age group

c = Number of children in district B to be retained (4.3% of all students)

Table 14

Classroom trends for kindergarten entry holding out and retention practices in district B

Classroom	Minority Enrollment	Mean Age	Std Dev	No. K students	No. Held Out (%)	No. Retained (%)	No. To Be Retained (%)	No. Recommended For Retention But To Be Promoted (%)
1d	61.1[a]/ 66.7[b]%	64.50	4.67	18	2 (11.1)	1 (5.6)	1 (5.6)	14 (77.8)
1a	63.6 / 72.7 %	65.47	5.62	22	5 (22.7)	2 (9.1)	2 (9.1)	10 (45.5)
1b	73.3 / 80.0 %	64.13	5.15	15	2 (13.3)	2 (13.3)	0	12 (80.0)
1c	89.5 / 89.5 %	67.42	9.07	19	3 (15.8)	2 (10.5)	0	10 (52.6)
1f	76.9 / 92.3 %	64.98	5.43	26	3 (11.5)	3 (11.5)	0	19 (73.1)
1e	93.1 / 96.6 %	63.69	6.19	29	4 (13.8)	2 (6.9)	0	14 (48.3)
2d	60.9 / 60.9 %	64.81	6.10	23	2 (8.7)	2 (8.7)	0	0
2b	61.9 / 66.7 %	63.57	4.80	21	3 (14.3)	0	0	0
2a	75.0 / 79.2 %	64.07	3.98	24	1 (4.2)	0	3 (12.5)	0
2c	80.0 / 84.0 %	64.20	4.13	25	5 (20.0)	2 (8.0)	0	0
3b	22.7 / 36.4 %	64.26	4.22	22	1 (4.5)	2 (9.1)	0	1 (4.5)
3a	79.2 / 83.3 %	63.93	4.27	24	0	2 (8.3)	0	0
4a	30.8 / 46.2 %	64.75	4.69	26	5 (19.2)	0	1 (3.9)	0
4c	48.1 / 51.9 %	63.32	5.25	27	2 (7.4)	2 (7.4)	1 (3.7)	0
4b	55.0 / 65.0 %	64.18	6.24	20	4 (20.0)	0	2 (10.0)	0
4d	96.3 / 96.3 %	63.73	4.86	27	3 (11.1)	0	1 (3.7)	0
5a	75.0 / 75.0 %	64.36	5.5	8	1 (12.5)	0	0	2 (25.0)

6d	80.0 / 86.7 %	63.60	5.01	30	0	2 (6.7)	0	6 (20.0)
6c	84.0 / 84.0 %	65.59	5.39	25	3 (12.0)	2 (8.0)	2 (8.0)	3 (12.0)
6a	100 / 100 %	65.29	6.65	30	3 (10.0)	2 (6.7)	1 (3.3)	1 (3.3)
6b	100 / 100 %	63.64	7.04	30	1 (3.3)	1 (3.3)	2 (6.7)	3 (10.0)
7b	70.4 / 96.3 %	64.26	4.70	27	4 (14.8)	1 (3.7)	0	8 (29.6)
7c	96.9 / 96.9 %	62.97	3.87	32	2 (6.3)	0	0	8 (25.0)
7a	100 / 100 %	65.33	5.09	34	2 (5.9)	1 (2.9)	3 (8.8)	7 (20.6)
8a	33.3 / 54.5 %	64.06	4.48	33	2 (6.1)	4 (12.1)	5 (15.2)	2 (6.1)
8b	34.4 / 37.5 %	63.06	4.41	32	1 (3.1)	2 (6.3)	6 (18.8)	0
8d	70.4 / 81.5 %	65.42	6.21	27	3 (11.1)	5 (18.5)	1 (3.7)	0
8c	90.3 / 93.5 %	65.28	4.61	31	3 (9.7)	2 (6.5)	1 (3.2)	1 (3.2)
9c	68.2 / 77.3 %	64.25	4.99	22	3 (13.6)	0	2 (9.1)	0
9a	73.7 / 94.7 %	65.94	9.10	19	3 (15.8)	0	0	0
9b	95.0 / 95.0 %	63.53	3.67	20	0	2 (10.0)	1 (5.0)	0
9d	95.2 / 100 %	64.10	4.07	21	2 (9.5)	0	0	0
10c	34.6 / 50.0 %	64.79	4.21	26	2 (7.7)	1 (3.8)	0	0
10d	37.0 / 59.3 %	63.68	5.55	27	3 (11.1)	0	2 (7.4)	1 (3.7)
10b	38.5 / 50.0 %	63.76	3.91	26	1 (3.8)	0	2 (7.7)	0
10a	97.1 / 97.1 %	65.06	4.82	34	3 (8.8)	1 (2.9)	1 (2.9)	0
11b	23.1 / 38.5 %	63.94	3.46	26	1 (3.8)	1 (3.8)	0	12 (46.2)
11a	45.5 / 50.0 %	65.11	5.38	22	3 (13.6)	3 (13.6)	1 (4.5)	0
11c	47.4 / 47.4 %	66.61	5.21	19	4 (21.1)	3 (15.8)	0	3 (15.8)
11d	55.6 / 55.6 %	66.28	4.57	18	5 (27.8)	0	1 (5.6)	0

a = percentage of students in the classroom who are Latino
b = percentage of students in the classroom who are not Anglo

Table 15

Classroom trends for kindergarten entry holding out and retention practices in district C

Classroom	Minority Enrollment	Mean Age	Std Dev	No. K students	No. Held Out (%)	No. Retained (%)
Total	51.0[a]/ 54.1[b]%	64.94	4.50	257	26 (10.1)	20 (7.8)
1b	19.2 / 23.1 %	66.69	4.98	26	11 (42.3)	0
1g	20.0 / 30.0 %	64.74	4.18	30	0	3 (10.0)
1f	20.7 / 24.1 %	64.26	3.47	29	2 (6.9)	0
1d	25.0 / 32.1 %	65.83	3.30	28	0	3 (10.7)
1h	31.0 / 34.6 %	66.04	4.20	29	5 (17.2)	3 (10.3)
1c	39.3 / 39.3 %	65.36	4.61	28	2 (7.1)	3 (10.7)
1a	100 / 100 %	63.46	5.34	29	5 (17.2)	0
1e	100 / 100 %	64.59	5.03	29	1 (3.4)	5 (17.2)
1i	100 / 100 %	63.70	4.60	29	0	3 (10.3)

a = percentage of students in the classroom who are Latino
b = percentage of students in the classroom who are not Anglo

Table 16

School trends for kindergarten entry: holding out and retention practicies

District and School	Minority Enrollment	No. K students	No. Held Out (%)	No. Retained (%)	No. To Be Retained (%)	No. To Be Advanced (%)
A 6	4[a]/ 7[b]%	56	5 (8.93)	3 (5.36)	3 (5.36)	not available
A 5	11 / 25%	51	5 (9.80)	0	0 (0)	
A 3	16 / 23%	49	6 (12.24)	2 (4.08)	4 (8.16)	
A 2	17 / 27%	82	12 (14.63)	2 (2.44)	3 (3.66)	
A 1	21 / 34%	56	4 (7.14)	5 (8.92)	4 (7.14)	
A 4	26 / 34%	92	13 (14.13)	8 (8.69)	8 (8.69)	
A 8	44 / 60%	111	4 (3.60)	10 (9.09)	18 (16.21)	
A 7	47 / 56%	89	5 (5.62)	3 (3.37)	4 (4.49)	
B11	41 / 47%	85	13 (15.3)	7 (8.2)	2 (2.4)	15 (17.6)
B 3	52 / 60%	46	1 (2.2)	4 (8.7)	0	1 (2.2)
B10	54 / 66%	113	9 (8.0)	2 (1.8)	5 (4.4)	1 (0.9)
B 8	56 / 63%	123	9 (7.3)	13 (10.6)	13 (10.6)	3 (2.4)
B 4	58 / 65%	100	14 (14.0)	2 (2.0)	5 (5.0)	0
B 2	69 / 73%	93	11 (11.8)	4 (4.3)	3 (3.2)	0
B 5	75 / 75%	8	1 (12.5)	0	0	2 (25.0)
B 1	77 / 84%	129	19 (14.7)	12 (9.3)	3 (2.3)	79 (61.2)
B 9	82 / 91%	82	8 (9.8)	2 (2.4)	3 (3.7)	0
B 7	90 / 97%	93	8 (8.6)	2 (2.2)	3 (3.2)	23 (24.7)
B 6	91 / 93%	115	7 (6.1)	7 (6.1)	5 (4.3)	13 (11.3)
C 1	51 / 54%	257	26 (10.1)	20 (7.8)	not available	not available

a = percentage of students in the school who are Latino
b = percentage of students in the school who are not Anglo

Table 17

Summary of results: Kindergarten study

Hypotheses		District		
		1	2	3
Age of entry:	Ethnicity	A > L	NS	A > L
	Gender	B > G	NS	NS
Held out:	Ethnicity	A > L	NS	NS
	Gender	B > G	NS	NS
Retained	Ethnicity	L > A	NS	NS
	Gender	B > G	NS	NS
Recommended for retention:	Ethnicity	L > A	NS	-
	Gender	B > G	NS	-
Recommended for retention but advanced:	Ethnicity	-	L > A	
	Gender	-	B > G	

A= Anglo
L= Latino
B= Boys
G= Girls